DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 041 SO 008 928

AUTHOR Hoffmann, Charles
TITLE American Historical Association Faculty Development Program: Planning and Implementation.
PUB DATE Dec 75
NOTE 13p.; For a related document, see SO 008 927; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association (Atlanta, Georgia, December 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Educational Planning; Effective Teaching; Guidelines; Higher Education; *History Instruction; Information Dissemination; *Inservice Programs; *Program Descriptions; *Program Planning; Staff Improvement; Teacher Education; *Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS American Historical Association; Faculty Development

ABSTRACT

The planning and implementation processes of the Long Island Faculty Development Program are described. Originally sponsored by the American Historical Association's Faculty Development Program to improve history instruction, this project includes faculty representatives from four Long Island universities, colleges, and junior colleges. The program plans to achieve maximum impact by selecting teams of five experienced, innovative teachers from each of the four participating institutions. These teams share experiences and resources with teachers from other institutions, acquire new skills, and then return to their home institutions to work as a nucleus for disseminating new teaching approaches among their colleagues. Three basic strategies used to launch the program include a content focus on historical areas and problems rather than teaching skills per se, a conscious effort to develop the broadest base of support among all levels of personnel and students, and emphasis on the ongoing need to improve teaching. Based on both the successes and mistakes of the program, 17 general and specific lessons that have been learned in the planning and implementation of the program are outlined. (Author/DE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED120041

SP 008 928

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

PLANNING & IMPLEMENTATION

by

Charles Hoffmann

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

PLANNING & IMPLEMENTATION

Background

In November, 1973, the AHA Subcommittee on Teaching suggested the possibility of the AHA sponsoring workshops on teaching skills, involving community colleges and four year schools and focusing on the problem of motivating students. The next month Professor William R. Taylor suggested a possible pilot program during the summer of 1974 at Stony Brook. This proposal was subsequently endorsed by the AHA Council in December.

Following the decision of the AHA, an informal planning group including Stony Brook faculty from History, Education, Theatre, and Economics met throughout January, February, and March of 1974 to begin organizing the Program which was designed as an 18 month effort involving three stages:

1) Planning - January-May, 1974

2) Summer Workshop - May-June, 1974

3) Implementation - September-June, 1974-75

In addition to Stony Brook (enrollment 15,400), three Long Island colleges participated in the pilot program--Nassau Community College (enrollment 18,000), two campuses of Suffolk Community College (enrollment 14,000), and the S.U.N.Y. Agricultural and Technical College at Farmingdale (enrollment 12,000). By April, 1974, the planning committee, now enlarged by representatives from all four participating institutions, had garnered support from the Lilly Endowment, the S.U.N.Y. Office of Educational Development, and the participating institutions.

We aimed at a "community of peers"--full involvement by all participants at every stage of the program. This did not mean abdication of a leading role by the Program Staff which had to be responsible for the enormous range of

FEB 17 1978

preparatory and follow-up activities generated by the program. All participants engaged in the planning process, and during the Summer Workshop responsibility for organizing each day's activities was rotated among individuals from each institution. The same rule has guided implementation activities.

The program planned to achieve maximum impact by selecting teams of five experienced, innovative teachers from each of the four participating institutions. These "teams" would share experiences and resources with teachers from other institutions, would acquire new skills, and then would return to their home institutions to work as a nucleus for disseminating new teaching approaches among their colleagues.

Each participant, working alone or in a team, undertook a specific project during the workshop--curriculum revision, the development of a simulation game, the preparation of oral history tapes or a video tape, and so forth--which then was completed as part of the program's follow-up activities. Small grants to cover expenses in such projects were made available.

In August 1974, as an outgrowth of a newly re-designed graduate course for secondary social studies teachers offered at Stony Brook (CES 529 "New Views of American History for Secondary School Teachers"), a new constituency consisting of secondary social studies teachers was added to the group.

The follow up phase of the Faculty Development Program began at the October 1974 Conference when a Long Island History and Social Science Consortium was formally inaugurated to coordinate program activities during the academic year. A Coordinating Committee of institutional and secondary school teacher representatives and a representative from the Program Staff has met regularly and has also organzied one-day conferences at each of the participating institutions for the purposes of recruiting further faculty support.

PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS

Based upon our own experience and an AHA evaluation of the first year's efforts, several assumptions guided the program's continuance into a second and third year:

1) First, the Long Island experience suggests that regional cooperation among institutions which share common bonds and problems is more likely to yield success than an isolated effort. Faculty development, however, must have a clearly defined focus--such as a discipline, a common problem or a shared task--which cuts across institutional differences.

2) Second, faculty development programs, to be effective, require provision for the continuing development of participants. Institutions must plan for an on-going, adequately supported program which enables faculty periodically to renew and deepen their teaching skills and, in some cases, to retrain themselves. These centers of initiative would ensure that there is a focal point for faculty development on each campus.

3) Third, appropriate professional organizations, such as the American Historical Association, or its counterparts, should be actively involved in faculty development wherever possible. Such organizations provide information on similar programs; a national outlet for the results of faculty development efforts; and the backing of a national association for faculty development programs seeking support from their administrations.

4) Finally, we want to re-emphasize that faculty development must be organized around the principle of a "community of peers." Participants must come together as equals to explore teaching problems together and planning must directly involve all participating institutions.

1975-76 PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND CONTENT

During 1975-1976, Nassau, Suffolk, Farmingdale, and Stony Brook have begun to establish centers of initiative for faculty development on each campus and have continued the coordinating committee as a mechanism for effective cooperation and planning among these centers. We are working toward institutionalization and currently the key activity--apart from the increasingly arduous task of obtaining local funds--is a teaching seminar of 20 fellows established among the four institutions and the secondary social studies teachers' constituency, and running throughout the academic year. Its purposes are five-fold:

1) to provide a clear "problem" focus that will serve as a hub for teachers working in diverse course contents with differing teaching philosophies;
2) to recruit and train new participants;
3) to train further several first-year participants who will organize and coordinate programs at their own campuses;
4) to sponsor specific, problem-oriented workshops, conferences, and research; and
5) to encourage innovative teaching through a program of small grants, funded principally from each campus.

There are many strategies that might be used to launch a faculty development program aimed at these goals but we chose to emphasize three basic guidelines. First, we are primarily concerned with history and its problems rather than with skills per se. Some programs emphasize the latter approach; they bring together teachers from many disciplines to learn skills deemed applicable in any teaching situation. However, we believe that more durable cooperation among institutions may result when colleagues zero in on problem areas of common concern--such as Western Civilization--and then together develop skills and techniques to tackle those problem areas.

Second we made a very conscientious effort to develop a broad base of support, including academic departments, instructional administrators, secondary teachers, students, and other interested persons. The program staff sought interviews with all levels of administrators at each constituent institution, including Stony Brook itself. We have vigorously sought support from participating colleges, from other S.U.N.Y. agencies, and from external sources. We have made many visits to each college in order to familiarize key administrators with the program. This effort has produced institutional support at a time of severe cutbacks in financing for higher education.

Third, we constantly emphasized the need to improve teaching. Without exception, this struck a responsive nerve in everyone with whom we consulted. We believe that the history profession, whose graduate programs have long emphasized the training of research scholars, must now give far greater attention to teaching skills, perhaps through a local "chapter" organization like the American Bar Association and other similar professional groups or through regional centers.

In addition to the teaching seminar, several other activities fill out the 1975-76 program and contribute to the evolving structure of a faculty development Center on each campus of the Consortium. In all of these activities the fellows and the coordinator from each campus form the active nucleus for implementing each program element:

1) one-day workshops on changing course content or instructional procedure;
2) extended workshops on teaching effectiveness;
3) groups of freshly recruited colleagues organized for the purpose of studying one another's teaching effectiveness: attending each other's classes, observing teaching strategies, and conducting evaluation sessions; and
4) instructional process clinics and active counselling-consulting with

Consortium staff to explore and develop new options for course presentation.

A final program element which carries over from the 1974 activities--small grants--has been structured so that those actively involved in the on-going 1975-1976 program, say fellows, as well as any faculty members may apply for a small grant. Such grants, not to exceed $300, are awarded by the Coordinating Committee if the grant proposal is considered a worthy effort advancing faculty development.

As a final note on our current efforts, we would like to underline a concern expressed above--that central as teaching skills are to faculty development, they must not become simply lessons in methods and hardware. We are working towards communicating new ways of historical inquiry to teachers and students. Furthermore the Research Group for Human Development and Educational Policy at Stony Brook, which conducts research on student culture, teaching and learning at the university, will communicate the results of its and other people's findings to seminar members actively engaged in reconsidering their teaching. The Research Group will also assess, through the utilization of standard instruments and the development of new ones, teaching procedures and cognitive and affective aspects of student learning in the participants' courses, as well as the effectiveness of the seminar and other program elements. The American Historical Association Faculty Development Program will thus attempt to evaluate what is different in the classroom as a result of its activities and how its activities are faring.

PLANNING LESSONS

One of the most valuable dividends from the AHA/FDP is the experience gained by participants in the program. We have learned a great deal about how to organize and coordinate a multi-institutional program from both our successes and our mistakes, and, from the often painful process of "doing" faculty development. To conclude these remarks, we would like to summarize briefly the most

important of the lessons we have learned to date. We recognize, of course, that conditions vary from institution to institution and region to region and that our experience will probably not be entirely applicable at other institutions and in other places. We are still in the process of evaluating our own experience, moreover, and we caution against construing the recommendations as in any sense "final." With that caveat, we offer these recommendations to others setting a similar course, not as a panacea, but as rough guidelines which may be useful:

1) Faculty development program efforts should not be planned and organized "by others for the participants." They should be planned and organized "by the participants for the participants."

2) The decision has to be made whether to go the consortium route or the single institution route.

3) A faculty development program which has a clearly definable focusing element--such as a disciplinary base, a central theme, a common problem, or shared task--is preferable to a generic faculty development program which does not have such a focusing element (this is especially critical in the initial stages of introducing the concept of faculty development to college faculty and administration).

4) Faculty development programs should make provision for a number of different programmatic stages:

a) an initial pre-planning stage: in which objectives are specified, the means of achieving these objectives are collaboratively determined and the allocation of responsibilities is agreed upon.

b) an operational stage: in which the participants carry out the activities developed during the initial pre-planning stage.

c) an implementation stage: in which the ideas, skills, materials, etc., developed during the operational stage are implemented by the

participants in their actual teaching situations.

d) an evaluation stage: in which the "documented experience" of the implementation stage is summarized, analyzed and evaluated by the participants.

e) a developmental pre-planning stage: which follows the format of the initial pre-planning stage but is now based upon the participants' experiences in the first cycle of the faculty development program.

5) Whenever possible, the appropriate professional organization (e.g. the American Historical Association, the American Philosophical Association, etc.) should be contacted, invited, and encouraged to actively support the faculty development program.

6) The appropriate members of the college administrations should be contacted, invited, and encouraged to actively support the faculty development program.

7) A consortium planning/coordinating committee should be organized in the very early phase of the program with representation from each of the participating institutions and should assume the responsibility for planning the activities of the faculty development program.

8) Institutions considering faculty development programs should, at an early stage, survey the existing pool of faculty, teachers, skills, special competencies and available institutional resources.

9) Faculty development programs, while they may require initial outside funding, should eventually become part of the regular college operating budget.

10) Faculty development program consortia should require that participating institutions provide financial support (their contributing share) to sustain the activities of the institution's participants.

11) In the selection of participants, an important criterion should be the participant's ability to identify a clearly stated set of objectives, the necessary conditions under which these objectives are to be realized, and the mode(s) of evaluating the degree to which these objectives have been attained.

12) In the selection of participants, special care should be given to the sensitivities, the established procedures, and the protocol of the participating institutions.

13) Faculty development programs should be organized around the principle of a "community of peers." This principle should be applied to mean that in cases where compensation is to be provided, the participants would all receive the same rate of compensation. Faculty development programs of a consortium type involving both two-year and four-year faculty must disabuse themselves of the idea that the four-year faculty will impart skills to the two-year faculty.

14) Faculty development programs should encourage "continuing faculty development" in supporting activities associated with participant's efforts to refine and extend projects, activities, etc., previously developed in the faculty development program as well as providing the opportunity for participants to explore new and different areas of interest.

15) Faculty development programs, to be effective, require provision for the continuing development of their participants and should not be conceived of as a short-term, one-shot "two-week" intensive workshop in which one can pick up whatever needs to be learned about the improvement of teaching and learning.

16) Ample provision for "formative" evaluations should be provided throughout the faculty development program. Evaluation should not be restricted to "summative" evaluation at the conclusion of the program, but rather should be

on-going and therefore provide the opportunity to benefit from the evaluation while there is still time to incorporate these modifications into the actual implementation of the program.

17) There should be a provision for publicizing the concept of faculty development and bringing the activities of the "local team" and the faculty development program consortium to the attention of other faculty members. This could be done by organizing programs (presentations, seminars, conferences, etc.) at each participating institution.

AHA FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

PARTICIPANTS

Staff

William R. Taylor, Director 1974-75
Charles Hoffmann Director 1975-76
George W. Schuyler, Associate Director
Eli Seifman, Teaching Services Consultant
Robert Levine, Teaching Seminar Coordinator, Fall 1975
Joseph Katz, Evaluation Consultant

Campus Coordinators

Richard Rapp, Stony Brook
Robert de Zorzi, Suffolk Community College Brentwood
William Hall, Suffolk Community College Selden, 1974-75
William Anderson, Suffolk Community College Selden, 1975-76
Frank Cavaioli SUNY Farmingdale 1974-75
Abdul Naseem, SUNY Farmingdale, 1975-76
Philip Nicholson, Nassau Community College, 1974-75
Paul Devendittis, Nassau Community College, 1975-76
Ernest Furnari, Jr., Long Island Secondary Schools

Faculty Participants

	Fall 1975 Teaching Seminar	1974-75 Small Grants	1974-75 Workshops
Farmingdale	4	2	8
Nassau	4	8	8
Suffolk Selden	1	1	7
Suffolk Brentwood	1	1	4
Stony Brook	4	12	10
Secondary Schools	4	2	7